



Community Involvement Plan Update

Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor Superfund Site

DRAFT---November 2000

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is committed to a strong community involvement program for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor Superfund Site on Bainbridge Island, Washington. This paper highlights upcoming community involvement activities, summarizes some current community concerns, provides background information about the site, and lists contacts.

Through the activities outlined here, EPA seeks to maintain open communication about the site cleanup. We want to provide interested parties with information they need and want, offer avenues of providing suggestions and feedback, and ensure that concerns are addressed and questions answered.

Inside:

Community Involvement
Activities
Current Community Concerns
Site Background and Status
Site Cleanup Schedule
Site Contacts
Appendix: Notes from Community
Interviews

The Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor site has reached an important milestone in the cleanup process. Cleanup decisions have been made, and the focus is now on the timely and efficient completion of cleanup work. Since there are no more cleanup decisions to be made, there are no more formal public comment periods. However, EPA will continue to keep the community informed and respond to questions or concerns.

Continuing Community Involvement Activities

Community involvement has been a cornerstone of the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor project from the beginning. EPA wants to maintain the relationships that have been established. We also want to make sure that community members continue to get information through

useful channels. Some specific activities to involve the community are listed below.

Fact Sheets and Other Mailers: EPA will continue to prepare occasional mailers to update interested members of the community about cleanup activities. These mailers are sent to everyone on EPA's mailing list for the site, and posted on EPA's Wyckoff webpage. To be added to or removed from the mailing list, call Andrea Lindsay at (206) 553-1896.

Community Meetings: At the request of community members, EPA will host another Community Information Meeting in spring 2001, before construction of the pilot treatment system begins. The meeting will be an opportunity for a status report and a chance to "check in" with the community. Additional future public meetings will be considered as needed.

Media Relations: EPA will continue to provide information about site activities to local newspapers, including the Seattle Times/PI, Bremerton Sun, Bainbridge Island Review. Press releases will be issued as needed. Display ads, as well as a community calendar listing in the Bainbridge Island Review, will be published to announce community meetings.

Coordination with Association of Bainbridge

Communities (ABC): EPA continues to coordinate with ABC, which has received Technical Assistant Grant funds from EPA. ABC uses these funds to hire a technical advisor to help understand and comment on technical aspects of the site cleanup. Funds also help ABC communicate with the community about the site through its newsletter Scotchbroom and other mechanisms. ABC raises technical issues, advises EPA about community concerns, contributes to select EPA fact sheets, and helps EPA identify ways to reach the community.

Reference Materials and Documents: The *Administrative Record* is a file that contains all information used by EPA to make decisions on the cleanup actions from the beginning of the site's history. The Administrative Record can be reviewed at the EPA Records Center, 7th Floor, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle. Call (206) 553-4494 to make an appointment. Select documents can be viewed at the *Information Repository* located at the Bainbridge Island Public Library, 1270 Madison

Avenue North. If the library does not have the document you need, feel free to call Andrea Lindsay, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator, at (206) 553-1896.

Current Community Concerns

Based on interviews and other discussions with community members, the community appears to be generally satisfied with EPA's public involvement effort to date. In June and July 2000, EPA conducted 11 interviews over the telephone with a cross-section of residents, community representatives, and local officials. Notes from these interviews are included here as an appendix. Also, EPA hosted a community meeting in September 2000, and learned first-hand about a range of concerns held by local residents. EPA addresses some common concerns below.

Noise--Residents are concerned about noise from sheet pile wall installation and operation of thermal treatment: EPA understands the community's concerns about noise; many of the cleanup activities can be quite loud. EPA has adjusted work schedules and is taking measures to reduce noise as much as possible. EPA is using mufflers and other noise reduction methods for the sheet pile wall installation. Early indications are that these noise reduction methods are working quite well. Similar efforts will be taken for the pilot thermal treatment plant; noise reduction measures will be designed into the system.

Fumes--Residents are concerned about odors and air emissions resulting from cleanup activities: EPA will use low-sulfur diesel fuel to run the boilers at the site. EPA will not be adding any more toxins to the environment. Emissions are expected to be very low, well below regulatory limits. It is EPA's goal that the surrounding community not be affected in any way by boiler emissions.

Lights--Some individuals are concerned about glare from the site. EPA will shroud the lights at the site to minimize glare.

Traffic--The community is concerned about additional truck traffic in the area, and about the safety of a blind-corner intersection leading to the site. EPA is considering ways to address the "blind spot" at the site's corner entrance, including caution lights and signs. EPA will also open the Taylor Avenue gate to be used for truck traffic entering and leaving the site. During pilot system operation, fuel will be delivered to the site by

truck, with 2-4 truck deliveries per week. However, when full-scale treatment begins and more fuel is needed, EPA will have the fuel barged in to minimize traffic concerns.

Water Source--Many individuals expressed concern about the possible drilling of a well on-site to provide water for cleanup activities, and urged EPA to instead use city treatment plant effluent. In response to community concerns, EPA has made a final decision to use the Wing Point sewage treatment plant effluent for boiler water, rather than drilling a new well.

Aquifer Monitoring--Community members have expressed concern about the cleanup activity's impacts on nearby aquifers. EPA does not expect there will be any effects on these aquifers. However, for added assurance, EPA will monitor drinking water wells at Bill Point and at South Eagle Harbor, and the aquifer below the contaminated aquifer under the site.

Development/Future Use--Many people have asked EPA what the ultimate use of the site is expected to be when cleanup is complete. EPA's goal is to clean the site's soil to residential standards. However, EPA does not make decisions about future land use at Superfund sites. It is the responsibility of local government to make land use decisions. The Wyckoff site is owned by Pacific Sound Resources Environmental Trust, not EPA. The Trust is authorized to sell the property; proceeds will be used to pay for cleanup and reimburse the Muckleshoot and Suquamish Tribes and Natural Resource Trustees for natural resource damages.

Site Access--Some individuals have asked EPA to allow public access to the site during cleanup. For health and safety reasons, EPA cannot provide public access to the site during cleanup.

Schedule--EPA has received many requests for long-term scheduling information. An estimated schedule for cleanup activities is provided below.

Site Background and Status

EPA listed Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor as a Superfund site in 1987. The site is divided into four work areas called "operable units." The operable units are: West Harbor, East Harbor, Wyckoff Soil, and Wyckoff Groundwater.

The former Wyckoff wood treating facility, located at the mouth of

Eagle Harbor on Bainbridge Island, operated from the very early 1900's to 1988. Soils at the facility, and groundwater beneath the facility, are severely contaminated. Contaminants include creosote and other wood treatment compounds. An estimated 1 million gallons of creosote product remains in the site's soil and groundwater. These contaminants pose a risk to public health and the environment.

A groundwater extraction and treatment system has been operated on site since 1990. However, contaminants are still moving into the marine environment and only relatively small amounts of contaminants are being removed.

In February 2000, EPA selected thermal treatment technologies to clean up remaining soil and groundwater contamination at the site. Thermal treatment involves heating the ground, then pumping out the contaminants, groundwater, and vapors. First, a sheet pile wall will be installed along the site's shoreline to prevent contamination from moving into the harbor. A shorter section of sheet pile will be installed inland for testing of a pilot thermal plant. If the pilot is successful, EPA will move ahead with full-scale treatment.

In Eagle Harbor, bottom sediments were severely contaminated with chemicals from wood-treating and shipyard operations. The sediments are toxic to marine organisms. A public health advisory is in effect recommending against eating fish and shellfish harvested from the harbor. Contaminated sediments were capped with clean material in 1994 and again in another location in 1997. This existing 50-acre cap is now being extended.

Because the sheet pile wall installation and capping work will affect existing habitat, EPA is currently creating new intertidal habitat along part of the Wyckoff shoreline. The project will provide 2 acres of new, clean habitat in the form of a gently sloping beach.

Site Cleanup Schedule

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Estimated Time</u>	
	<u>of Completion</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Sheet pile wall installation	before 2/15/01	Weekday
business hours only		
Habitat site creation	before 2/15/01	
Sediment capping	2003	Will take 2-3
construction seasons		

Thermal pilot design	December 2000	
Underwater pipeline to site	before 2/15/01	Constructi on may be delayed until
	(if possible)	August 2001 due to Endangered Species Act issues
Thermal pilot construction	October 2001	
Thermal pilot cleanup	October 2002	
Full scale thermal design is successful	December 2002	Assuming pilot
Full scale thermal construction	April 2003	
Full scale thermal cleanup residential standards	2012	Goal:cleanup to

Site Contacts

Hanh Gold

EPA Project Manager
Wyckoff Groundwater and Soils (Thermal Treatment)
(206) 553-0171
E-mail: gold.hanh@epa.gov

Ken Marcy

EPA Project Manager
Eagle Harbor (Sheet Pile Wall, Habitat Mitigation, Capping)
(206) 553-2782
E-mail: marcy.ken@epa.gov

Andrea Lindsay

EPA Community Involvement Coordinator
(206) 553-1896
E-mail: lindsay.andrea@epa.gov.

Toll-Free Telephone Number

1-800-424-4372

EPA Web Site:

www.epa.gov/r10earth/
click on "index" at the bottom
click on "W" for Wyckoff

Additional services can be made available to persons with

disabilities by calling EPA toll-free at 1-800-424-4372.

Appendix:

**Wyckoff Eagle/Harbor Superfund Site
Notes from Community Interviews
Conducted June-July 2000**

All interviews were conducted by phone. Questions were generally as follows:

- What concerns do you have that we should be aware of?
- What kinds of information do you want?
- How frequently do you want information?
- Do you find the occasional mailers from EPA useful?
- How can EPA best provide you information about site activities? (mailers, meetings...)
- How do you feel about EPA's efforts so far to inform and involve the public?
- What could we have done better or differently?
- Is there anything else we should consider as we plan for future public involvement at this site?

Interview # 1

Concerns relate to importance of achieving cleanup and continuing with process to get us to cleanup. Site is so heavily contaminated -- a time bomb - gradually releasing contamination to harbor. Threatens fresh water aquifers under site. Toxic site in community needs to be addressed.

Information--Happy with quantity and level of info -- very pleased with inclusive process. Technical end of things is important -- technical advisor review important -- good level of EPA coverage of issues, from general to technical.

Newsletter excellent; helpful, timely. Face-to-face mtgs are good. Good to have chance to ask questions. Frequency is commensurate with need.

Gives EPA an A for public participation -- excellent -- couldn't have done a better job -- terrific!
Recognize that public isn't that interested. Low hearing turnout = just the nature of our society.
Appreciate our efforts to go extra distance.

No - couldn't do better or differently. Good job leaving lines of communication open.

With wall installation, build in some breaks; constant noise is a weakness. Make sure there is flexibility in contract for work hours. Be well prepared for public mtg. Have more than 1 public meeting, before and during wall installation. Make it clear there is no other way to achieve cleanup.

Fumes are a concern, too.

The only issue is that EPA appears to place emphasis on cost over community concerns, biased toward using a process which is "least expensive" -- i.e., diesel fuel vs. propane (ironically, EPA nationally just moved to control diesel truck emissions). Cost issue limits quality of process.

EPA should take a more "whole earth approach"; i.e., cut off logs sent to landfill -- moving problems from one media to another. Reselling creosote to another creosote plant.

Overall EPA rating: "A"

Interview #2

no return phone call

Interview #3

no return phone call

Interview #4

This site is costing taxpayers a fortune.

Their neighborhood used to get water from aquifer at Wyckoff. EPA took away water supply -- nothing wrong with it. Now their current system isn't adequate. EPA never attempted to give financial support for drinking water.

EPA doesn't have any idea how many pollutants there are.

Very long process.

Big gov't came in, but hasn't fixed it. Lots of staff turnover. When will we quit!
But he has learned to live with it.

Mailers not useful, but has read it.

Original study was poorly done/speculation.

EPA money to ABC was totally wasted; they are environmental extremists -- they never communicate in a real way to the diversity of community.

Skeptical that technology will work.

Pollutants haven't done him any harm.

Thinks we should stop completely. But he feels that many people depend financially on Wyckoff -- who wants to stop it?

Interview #5

Disappointed with how draft mitigation proposal came out. When cleanup shifted to thermal then offshore impacts changed. City had false assumption. Mitigation not in draft ROD in detail -- only mentioned. No opportunity for community to comment. ABC felt left out too. Change in personnel thru cleanup was a factor, since Peter R left too.

Information is timely.

Wants a better understanding of relationship and role of ABC TAG. What is expected from them -- what do they do with funds and community liaison role. Expectations for city role.

Mailers very useful -- not too technical-- good level of detail. Good frequency -- whenever there is activity to report.

Good that Ken calls city ahead of time when needed -- Continue to let them know so they can respond to calls.

Public meetings not well attended lately -- not as much interest. Newspaper notices are useful and mailings to neighborhood groups.

Talking to full city council is important. Good as part of public meeting opportunity, in addition.

Good job on ROD switch -- containment to thermal.

Consider providing an independent briefing also to the Harbor

commission -- harbor plan -- meet monthly.

Interview #6

Concerned about noise from vibration hammers and boiler driven steam system affecting quality of life. Also concerned about diesel fumes (odor and health) -- would prefer propane or natural gas. Wing and bill point affected.

Lights for operation need to be shielded.

Feel like we've been heard, but not sure concerns have been addressed. Want some specific assurances that nuisances will be minimized and how -- what's the method

Opportunities for involvement have been gratifying but still in the dark on mitigating measures.

Useful mailers -- good detail and level of technicality -- but lacking info on specific assurances (i.e., decibels of hammers and shroud to cut decibels). What are ppms for diesel and how will they be cut. Want hard numbers. There are ways to mitigate. Tell us how and whether you will use them.

Email with reply opportunity is sometimes useful.
Mailers are as good as anything.

Haven't been any real surprises about EPA activities - that's good (except a couple of pile drives recently and some drilling).
Haven't felt left out.

Public meetings haven't been well attended -- is there a message there?

Concerned about expenditure of public money associated with thermal. EPA pursued it even though the community felt they could live with existing pollution. Never explained why EPA rejected capping, when it was once deemed acceptable.

Interview #7

Interest is fishing rights, including treaty reserve, fishery resources and habitat. This area is their usual and accustomed fishing area.

Documents from Ken and Hahn are good. Useful mailers, but can get more detail from technical documents.

For the tribe EPA's efforts have been good:

- level of communication
- meetings
- opportunities to review various documents
- Nothing we could have done better or differently

They have been working w/EPA on gov't-to-gov't basis. Tribe wants active role and feels they have it. They don't fit the mold as a community group.

Interview #8

Should not compromise environmental standards at the site. Should be highest and best cleanup possible -- it's visible and it's model geology of a sandpit -- concerned about riprap bulkhead -- totally out of line -- even EPA workshop says shouldn't do this. Move toward pristine and natural environment as much as possible.

The well probably could have been saved.

Already cleaner than gas work parks.

No accurate accounting of dollars spent. Originally 7-10M. Now taxpayers paying much more. Has contacted Inslee regarding cost.

Pushing for public park there. Wants National historic landmark at the site and is working with National Park Service (Stephanie Toothman). May affect western portion of Wyckoff property. (Japanese internment departure site). May be a done deal.

Lots of commercial interest on site. Talking to key archeologist and planners. 2 weeks ago, he took Buddhist Monks over to Wyckoff to consider the site for a peace pagoda.

Old historic buildings pulled down unnecessarily -- inconsistently of logic.

West dock gone -- could have grandfathered it? Only 2 boat launching ramp now on BI.

The community has doubled in 10 years. No gathering place large enough for the community - but there is an opportunity to build

something to accommodate them at Wyckoff.

Could have boats as commute vessel to Wyckoff site with glass bottoms, an environmental education opportunity.

Residential use should be limited to hillside.

Info Needs:

- Funding info. Forewarning for development opportunities
- Role of tribe, NOAA, trust, etc.
- Comparative analysis to gas work park. (Contractors have quit there because they thought it was clean enough.)
- Use human terms (i.e, risk is like smoking 4 cigarettes a day)

Mailers are useful. As often as needed.

Barbed wire and ugliness of site.
Aware of vandalism issues)

Would like to see public beach walks there at low tide with naturalist/historian.

Public involvement is very difficult -- connecting to lay person. People don't know enough. EPA knocked itself out - how could you do more?

Consider TV -- documentaries -- (cable access channel)

Need a schedule -- look way ahead -- vision.

Interview #9

After thermal, then mitigation plan came up. ABC hasn't involved community on that issue.

Communicate schedules for sheet pile and cleanup.

In the short range, there's a well going in -- not well known -- now get to community with realistic details.

In the long-range - what's going to happen to the site after it's cleaned up? People are already bidding. To what level will it be cleaned? Give us a range -- a time line -- when will it be ready for sale?

Tell us what's going to happen? EPA short-term plans and long-term.

Bulletins are useful -- right level of detail -- frequency is fine. Need to update mailing list. Need to do return mailing.

Notes a low level of involvement for bill point.

Where will water come from -- sewer?

EPA efforts so far -- fairly good; often passive; interest is lower than it was originally.

What could EPA do better or differently? Use scare tactics to build interest (just kidding!). Make sure public is aware of ramifications of cleanup. Make sure we use the newspapers!

Interview #10

no return phone call

Interview #11

Mid-level bureaucracy in city is acting separately from will of the people. Concerned about the Planning dept. Concern the property will be developed counter to wishes of the people.

Some development inevitable, even advantageous.

Developers very savvy as to process, but citizens aren't -- they make it a done deal and they lie. Developers get around regulatory process. Need a land use attorney to advocate for people.

Need info to help people know what levers they have to stop development.

Regulatory measures can work. The science is there and EPA knows what to do.

Please talk with his attorney, include her on the interview list (done).

People don't have time to get involved. People are not passionate about this. Keep info short.

Would like to see open space and city park. Not a big shopping and boat and commercial center - there is no infrastructure to support more people here.

He is a newer resident.

Use the newspaper. Local access cable channel -- specific to Bainbridge. Fliers.

Interview #12

Wyckoff is prime piece of property.

Not aware of progress -- is not following project. Not on mailing list.

Reads Bainbridge Review.

Make it a park; not another Seattle.

Would like a site tour; interested in technology. Could be advocate of doing the right thing.

Skeptical about cost and whether they even know what they're doing. Very expensive -- money pit; slush fund. How long does this go on?

People do want to be involved. Need to do public meeting.

Interview #13

There's is not a formal neighborhood association -- just have bylaws and covenants -- do some info disbursement -- coordinate monthly.

Was chair of Wyckoff Zoning Advisory Committee -- named by Mayor in 95 -- met with Peter R. and Al Lowe and 2 public meetings well attended.

Major concerns about public access to site property given unique vistas - should be public access after cleanup -- need shoreline access -- a way to walk around.

Traffic is a concern when development occurs. Don't want to make

it a bigger road.

Protect vegetation and wild life habitat; still some deer activity.

Public info is important. Public discussion. Give information about:

- When things are going to happen
- Development information; who's looking at property
- Noise; visual impacts -- when - schedules and revisions -- giving some notice and updates. People need to know when quiet periods will come. Can't say it too many times: we know it bothers you; we are sorry.

Good job with newsletters.

Public info is difficult; hard to get people engaged. Consider a newsletter on the ferry. Use Seattle papers -- too many don't read local.

EPA has done an average-pretty good job. Level of technicality is good. Don't know what else you could do, though. Was a long time period when things were quiet. Could do more frequent updates.

Instead of public meeting, do meetings in wing point and bill/rockaway beach independently - a Saturday or Sunday meeting.

Never minimize potential problems -- acknowledge them.

Alert people that noise may bother animals. Keep them inside if normally bothered by fireworks.

Give facts and explanation -- explain fish windows.

Interview #14

Is there any oversight by city? What is the schedule? What environmental issues are there?

Pilot study should measure noise -- measure against applicable noise code in city.

To what level will site be cleaned up? Is zoning considered? Does EPA consider city zoning when determining cleanup levels? (called back with info--goal is residential, city zoning is

separate issue and not directly considered, we have placed no restrictions on trust but there will be some institutional controls)

Has not been on the mailing list. (added)

If you have something to report, then send out a mailer. Direct mail is best.

Didn't know EPA is doing anything to involve public -- please send ROD. Knew about site from paper. Haven't attended public meetings.

More people like to read Seattle Paper than local paper.